

Application No. 10/801,183
Filed: 17 March 2004
Amendment Page 5 of 8

Amendments to the Drawings:

None

Application No. 10/801,183
Filed: 17 March 2004
Amendment Page 6 of 8

Remarks

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by US 4,383,819 (Letica) noting in particular that Letica teaches the claimed mold assembly having an actuating pin (18) that is oblique. This rejection is traversed. Comments concerning this rejection shall be made with reference to the claims as amended hereby.

Letica do not teach or suggest that the means for retaining actuating pin 18 be accessible from the parting line face of the mold component in which the actuating pin is retained. As shown in Fig. 2 of Letica, actuating pin 18 is retained by means accessible from the side of mold component 16 perpendicular to parting line faces of first and second mold portions 11 and 12. Contrary to the teaching of Letica in this regard, claim 1 of the present invention requires that the means for retaining the actuating pin be accessible from the parting line face of the mold component in which the actuating pin is retained. This arrangement of the invention overcomes the disadvantages of constructions such as illustrated by Letica as discussed at paragraph 0004 of the written description of the subject application. Hence, claim 1 is patentably distinct from the teachings of Letica and the rejection thereof should be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,824,256 (Ballester) noting in particular that Ballester teaches a mold assembly having an actuating pin (42) that is oblique in regards to the second mold member (Fig. 6). This rejection is traversed. Comments concerning this rejection shall be made with reference to the claims as amended hereby.

Ballester do not teach or suggest that the means for retaining actuating pin 42 be accessible from the parting line face of the mold component in which the actuating pin is retained. As shown in Figs. 1 and 6 of Ballester, actuating pin 42 is retained by means accessible from the side of cavity component 26 perpendicular to parting line faces of male and female mold members 4 and 6. Contrary to the teaching of Ballester in this regard, claim 1 of the present invention requires that the means for retaining the actuating pin be accessible from the parting line face of the mold component in which the actuating pin is retained. This arrangement of the invention overcomes the disadvantages of constructions such as illustrated by Ballester as discussed at paragraph 0004 of the written description of the subject

Application No. 10/801,183
Filed: 17 March 2004
Amendment Page 7 of 8

application. Hence, claim 1 is patentably distinct from the teachings of Ballester and the rejection thereof should be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claim 2 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Letica, noting in particular that Letica teach the mold assembly including the slide member and actuating pin and means for retaining the actuating pin in the second mold component (element A of Fig. 2). This rejection is traversed. Comments concerning this rejection shall be made with reference to the claims as amended hereby.

Letica do not teach or suggest that the means for retaining actuating pin 18 be accessible from the parting line face of the mold component in which the actuating pin is retained. As shown in Fig. 2 of Letica, element A (annotated by the Examiner) is accessible from a side of mold component 16 perpendicular to the parting line face of first and second mold portions 11 and 12. Contrary to the teaching of Letica in this regard, claim 1 of the present invention requires that the means for retaining the actuating pin be accessible from the parting line face of the mold component in which the actuating pin is retained. This arrangement of the invention overcomes the disadvantages of constructions such as illustrated by Letica as discussed at paragraph 0004 of the written description of the subject application. Hence, claim 2, dependent directly from claim 1, is patentably distinct from the teachings of Letica and the rejection thereof should be withdrawn.


The Examiner has objected to claims 3 – 6 as being depended upon a rejected base claim, indicating that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. In light of the patentability of claims 1 and 2 over the references cited, it is contended that claims 3 – 6, dependent directly or indirectly from claims 1 and 2, are likewise patentable and this objection should be withdrawn.

The Examiner has annotated the Information Disclosure Statements filed with the application and submitted 16 November 2005 as having been considered. The Examiner has not annotated the Information Disclosure Statement submitted 21 March 2005 as having been considered. A copy thereof is enclosed together with the facsimile confirmation of complete transmission thereof. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner annotate the enclosed Information Disclosure Statement as having been considered.

Application No. 10/801,183
Filed: 17 March 2004
Amendment Page 8 of 8

In light of the amendments of the claims presented hereby, it is contended that the pending claims patentably distinguish over the references whether considered singly under 35 USC §102 or in combination under 35 USC §103. Reconsideration of the application as amended is requested and an early notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

By 
John W. Gregg, Attorney
Reg. # 29925
513/487-5980

Enclosures